



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/001,939	11/02/2001	Gilles Bellaton	13220.004001; P5839	8875

32615 7590 07/08/2005

OSHA LIANG L.L.P./SUN
1221 MCKINNEY, SUITE 2800
HOUSTON, TX 77010

EXAMINER

LIN, KELVIN Y

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2142

DATE MAILED: 07/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/001,939

Applicant(s)

BELLATON ET AL.

Examiner

Kelvin Lin

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 April 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

PS

Detailed Action

Response to Remarks

1. The Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-21 have been considered but are not persuasive. Examiner appreciates detail description of prior art. Regarding claims 1, 16, and 19, applicant argues that "Byrne fails to teach or suggest the present invention as the multiplexer neither queries nor receives user access control data. In fact only when the authentication is completed at the remote server, does the multiplexer authenticate the user (See e.g. paragraphs [0059]-[0061] of the Instant Specification)".

Examiner contends Byrne discloses that the multiplexer (Byrne, col.6, l.13-16, corresponds to Server1) sends (Microsoft Computer Dictionary, 2001, forward defines as send) authentication query (Byrne, col.2, l. 50-55, query corresponds to LDAP request) from multiplexer to a first remote server, wherein the first remote server holds the user entry (Byrne, col.6, l.14-15, in which server3 corresponds to the first remote server holds the user entry). Therefore this is totally satisfying the reason to reject the claims 1, 16, and 19.

In response to applicant's argument that the reference fails to show certain features of applications invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e. "multiplexer neither queries nor receives user access control data..") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not

read into the claim(s). See *In re Van Genus*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Response to Amended Claims

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Byrne et al., (U.S. Patent 6708170).
4. Regarding claim 1, Byrne teaches a method to support access control checks in a directory server with a chaining backend, comprising:
- binding a user to a multiplexer (Byrne, col.5, l.12-14, “authentication server is treated as a multiplexer”, col.5, l.30-31);
 - forwarding an authentication sequence from the multiplexer to a first remote server, wherein the first remote server holds the user entry (Byrne, col.2, l.67, col.5, l.35-67, col. 6, l.1-60) ;

- binding the user to the first remote server (Byrne, col. 6, l.60);
- authenticating the user if binding to the first remote server is successful (Byrne, Fig.5, Fig. 7, col.6, l. 62-63);
- binding the multiplexer as a special user to a second remote server, wherein the second remote server holds target data (Byrne, col.5, l.35-37, col.8, l.6-7, l.57);
- sending an operation and an original user identity from the user to the multiplexer (Byrne, col.7, l.50-55); and
- forwarding the operation from the multiplexer to the second remote server (Byrne, col.7, l.50-60) .

5. Regarding claim 2, Byrne further discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising:

- retrieving an access control information statement from an access control list stored on the second remote server (Byrne, Fig. 4a, col.5, l.66-67, col.6, l.4-5); and
- evaluating the operation by the second remote server using the access control statement of the user (Byrne, col.7, l.51-57).

6. Regarding claim 3, Byrne further discloses the method of claim 2, wherein the access control information statement is stored as an attribute of an entry on the

second remote server (Byrne, col. 7, l.56-58).

7. Regarding claim 4, Byrne further discloses the method of claim 3, wherein the access control information statement comprises a target and an access control rule (Byrne, col. 7, l.52-54).
8. Regarding claim 5, Byrne further discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising:
 - retrieving an access control information statement from an access control list stored on the multiplexer (Byrne, col.5, l.55-65); and
 - evaluating the operation by the multiplexer using the access control statement of the user (Byrne, col.7, l.53-58).
9. Regarding claim 6, Byrne further discloses the method of claim 5, wherein the access control information statement is stored as an attribute of an entry on the multiplexer (Byrne, col.8, l.37-39).
10. Regarding claim 7, Byrne further discloses the method of claim 6, wherein the access control information statement comprises a target and an access control rule (Byrne, col. 7, l.20).
11. Regarding claim 8, Byrne further discloses the method of claim 1, wherein forwarding the authentication sequence to the first remote server occurs when a realm value sent in a digest challenge is not interpreted by the directory server, a target host name field of a digest response is not checked by the directory server, and the first remote server is part of a common realm (Byrne, col. 7, l.31-35).

12. Regarding claim 9, Byrne further discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the operation comprises an internal operation portion and a user issued operation portion (Byrne, col.8, l.13-15).
13. Regarding claim 10, Byrne further discloses the method of claim 9, further comprising: chaining the internal operation portion based on an identity of a component issuing the internal operation (Byrne, col.5, l.27-34).
14. Regarding claim 11, Byrne further discloses the method of claim 2, further comprising: enabling retrieval of the access control information statement on a remote server basis (Byrne, col.8, l.9-12).
15. Regarding claim 12, Byrne further discloses the method of claim 2, further comprising: disabling retrieval of the access control information statement on a remote server basis (Byrne, col.6, l.65-67).
16. Regarding claim 13, Byrne further discloses the method of claim 6, further comprising: retrieving the entry to evaluate an access control list on the multiplexer (Byrne, col.8, l.17-20).
17. Regarding claim 14, Byrne further discloses the method of claim 13, wherein the entry comprises a user (Byrne, col.7, l.54).
18. Regarding claim 15, Byrne further discloses the method of claim 13, wherein the entry comprises a group (Byrne, col. 7, l.55).
19. Regarding claims 16-18 have similar limitations as claims 1-2, and 5.
Therefore, claims 16-18 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-2, and 5.

Art Unit: 2142

20. Regarding claims 16-18 have similar limitations as claims 1-2, and 5.

Therefore, claims 16-18 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-2, and 5.

21. Regarding claims 19-21 have similar limitations as claims 1-2, and 5.

Therefore, claims 19-21 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-2, and 5.

Conclusion

22. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTH from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kelvin Lin whose telephone number is 571-272-3898.

The examiner can normally be reached on Flexible 4/9/5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

Art Unit: 2142

supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on 571-272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

kyl
07/05/05

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Andrew Caldwell". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

**ANDREW CALDWELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**